

THE SEALING DISPUTE.

Voluminous Correspondence Laid Before the House.

The Question Assumes a Serious Aspect—The Objections of Canada Retard Negotiations—Secretary Blaine Uses Plain Language.

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The correspondence between the State Department and the British Government touching the Behring sea negotiations was laid before the House yesterday afternoon. It is extremely voluminous, covering many hundreds of pages of typewritten manuscript. It is accompanied by a note from the Secretary of State which states that the negotiations are still in progress.

The correspondence consists of thirty letters and telegrams. It begins with a letter from Mr. Edwards, Secretary of the British Legation, to Mr. Blaine at New York, August 21, 1890, complaining that the United States cruisers have seized British vessels in the Behring sea outside the three-mile limit and requesting by direction of Marquis Salisbury that stringent orders be issued to prevent such a course.

Mr. Blaine replied on August 24, 1890, that the United States Government desires to have such an adjustment of the question which will remove misunderstanding but that the President believes that the responsibility for delay in the adjustment can not be properly charged to the United States Government. He requests that Mr. Edwards express the satisfaction of the United States Government that Sir John Panncoote will be ready on his return to discuss the whole question.

A letter from the Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Edwards, dated October 2, 1890, states that the British Government realizes the importance of an international agreement between the United States, Great Britain and Russia on the subject, and says Panncoote will be furnished the requisite instructions in case the Secretary of State desires to enter upon the discussion. In another dispatch of the same date he calls attention to the seizure of the British sealers by United States vessels outside of the three-mile limit, and says that Secretary Bayard stated unofficially that no further seizures of this character would be carried on pending the discussion and expresses regret that this understanding has not been carried out. He closes by a protest of the Government and expresses the opinion of the Government that the seizures were wholly unjustifiable.

Mr. Edwards says of the assurance referred to above by Lord Salisbury that it was an assurance communicated unofficially to his Lordship by the United States Minister in London and also by Mr. Bayard to Sir Lionel West in the month of April, 1890.

In a long letter, January 1, 1890, Mr. Blaine goes into a discussion of the general subject, stating that the United States Government on the east, the Aleuts of Alaska and the Russian Government on the west of Behring sea have until 1891 exercised the unquestioned right to take seals in the Behring sea. He says it was a case of surprise to the United States that the British Government should interfere to defend the Canadian vessels in attempting to take seals in Behring sea, and says: "Whence did the ships of Canada derive the right to do in 1890 what they had refrained from doing for nearly ninety years? Upon what ground did her Majesty's Government defend in 1890 a course in Behring sea which she had carefully avoided ever since the discovery of that sea? By what reasoning did her Majesty's Government conclude that an act may be committed with impunity against the rights of the United States which had never been attempted against the same rights when held by the Russian Government?"

After a long statement of the damage to fur seals which has followed the incursions of the British sealing vessels in the sea, he says: "The President does not conceive that her Majesty's Government could in fact be less indifferent to those results than is the Government of the United States. But he hopes that her Majesty's Government will, after this frank expression of views, readily comprehend the position of the United States touching this serious question. The Government has been ready to concede much in order to adjust all differences of views and in the judgment of the President has already proposed a solution not only equitable but generous. Thus far her Majesty's Government has declined to accept the proposal of the United States. The President now awaits with deep interest, untroubled with solicitude, any proposition for reasonable adjustment which her Majesty's Government may submit."

On February 10, 1890, Sir Julian Pauncoote says in a letter to Mr. Blaine that the British Government is now ready to resume the tripartite negotiations respecting the establishment of a close time for the seal fisheries, which was commenced in 1888 but suspended for various causes, and suggests that the negotiations be resumed in Washington.

The next communication is from Sir Julian Pauncoote to Mr. Blaine, and is marked, "Received April 30, 1890," indicating that meantime the negotiations had been in progress. It begins by saying: "At the last sitting of the conference on the Behring sea fisheries is expressed doubt whether any arrangement could be arrived at which would be satisfactory to Canada." He thus proposed that a mixed commission be agreed upon to consider the whole question and sealing be suspended in Behring sea during certain periods pending the work of that commission.

In a letter dated May 22, 1890, Salisbury replies to the arguments of Blaine in regard to the claim of exclusive rights to Behring sea. He denies this claim and holds that Great Britain has always maintained when questions arose the right to take seal in Behring sea, and, quoting a statement by Mr. Blaine that the President believes all friendly nations will concede to the United States the same rights which were formerly conceded to Russia in this matter, says: "Her Majesty's Government will have no difficulty in making such a concession. The right they have demanded have been those of free navigation and fishing in waters which previous to their own acquisition of Alaska, the United States declared to be free and open to all foreign vessels."

On May 23, 1890, Sir Julian Pauncoote in a letter to Mr. Blaine calls attention to newspaper reports that the United States cruisers have been instructed to prevent foreign vessels entering upon seal fisheries in non-territorial waters, and says: "I am instructed by the Marquis of Salisbury to state to you that a formal protest by her Majesty's Government against any such interference with British vessels will be forwarded to you without delay."

To this Mr. Blaine, on May 29, replies in a long communication on, in which he says: "In fact I am instructed by the President to protest against the course of the British Government in authorizing, encouraging and protecting vessels which are not only interfering with American rights in the Behring sea, but doing violence to the rights of the civilized world." He says that the President is surprised at the protest of the

British since Lord Salisbury, on November 11, 1887, in an official interview with the United States Minister, Phelps, cordially agreed that a code for the preservation of the seals should be adopted and suggested that Minister Phelps should present a system of regulations, which was done, and on February 23 Mr. Phelps notified Secretary Bayard that Lord Salisbury assents to the proposition to establish a close time for fur seals between April 15 and November 1 and between 160 to 170 degrees of longitude, and will cause an act to be introduced in Parliament to give effect to this arrangement. He adds that on the following April 23 the American charge at London was instructed that this plan would be perfected by an order in council five days later; however, on April 28, the charge was informed that no action would be taken until Canada is heard from, and for several weeks no further information could be had on the subject. He was finally told that the Canadian Government objected to any such restrictions and until her consent could be had the British Government was not willing to go into the convention.

Mr. Blaine adds: "Can the Government of the United States be expected to accept as final a decision of the Government of Great Britain that an agreement can not be fulfilled because Canada objects? The change of policy would be by her Majesty's Government without notice and against the wish of this Government, as, in the President's belief, because of all the differences that have followed. I am further instructed by the President to say that while the proposals of April 20 can not be accepted, the United States will continue the negotiations in hope of reaching an agreement."

The President's opinion, owing to the delays for which the Government is not responsible, is that it is too late to conclude this season's work. He therefore proposes that her Majesty's Government do not permit the vessels to enter the Behring sea this season in order to give time for negotiations."

In reply to this Pauncoote on June 3, says: "Her Majesty's Government are quite willing to adopt all measures which shall be satisfactorily proven to be necessary for the preservation of the fur seal species, and to enforce such measures on British subjects by proper legislation. But they are not prepared to agree to such a regulation as is suggested in your letter for the present fisheries season, as apart from the considerations there would be no legal power to enforce its observance on British subjects and British vessels."

In reply Mr. Blaine states that the President greatly regrets that the British Government can not agree to the proposition, which would suspend what Lord Salisbury described in 1888 as "the wanton destruction of a valuable industry." In a later note he suggests that if it is impossible to, by legal action, prevent British ships from engaging in this fishing for a season the United States Government would be satisfied with a simple proclamation requesting a suspension. To this the Minister replies that he will forward the suggestion and will, meantime, withhold the protest which had been forwarded him by the British Government.

On June 14, however, he states in another letter that seeing by the public press that the United States revenue cutters had been dispatched to Behring sea with instructions to seize British sealers, he can not further withhold the formal protest of his Government, which he accordingly presents. This protest states that the British Government desires an amicable adjustment of the questions at issue, but that it can not admit the right of the United States on its sole motion to restrict the navigation of Behring sea and adds: "The undersigned is in consequence instructed formally to protest against such interference and to declare that her Britannic Majesty's Government must hold the United States responsible for the consequences that may ensue from acts which are contrary to the established principles of international law."

On June 27 Pauncoote lays before the Secretary of State a counter proposition from the British Government relative to a temporary adjustment of the matter. It proposes first a committee of arbitration; second, pending that arbitration all interference with British sealing vessels shall also utterly cease; and third, that if the decision is adverse to the United States it shall compensate British subjects for their losses in suspension of operations during the progress of the arbitration.

Mr. Blaine makes no direct reply to this but on June 30 sends a twenty-six page (type-written) letter in which he goes into a detailed discussion of the history of Behring sea and the ground which the United States has constantly taken in the matter and closes by saying: "I am justified, therefore, in repeating the question addressed to her Majesty's Government on the 22d of last January and which is still unanswered. Whence did the ships of Canada derive the right to do in 1890 what they had refrained from doing for ninety years? Upon what ground did that Government defend in 1890 a course in Behring sea which had been carefully avoided ever since the discovery of that sea? By what reason did her Majesty's Government conclude that an act may be committed with impunity against the rights of the United States which had never been attempted against the same rights when held by the Russian Empire?"

The closing letter of the series is dated Bar Harbor, July 19, and is addressed to Sir Julian Pauncoote. In it Mr. Blaine discusses the question as to the breaking of the negotiations which were in progress in 1890 and which were understood by this Government to have been suspended owing to the refusal of Canada to agree to them and after a lengthy discussion of the matter closes by saying: "The interposition of the wishes of a British province against a convention between two nations which, according to the United States Minister (Phelps), has been virtually agreed upon except as to details, was in the President's belief a grave injustice to the United States."

More Favorable Report.

OMAHA, Neb., July 24.—The fortnightly crop report of the Union Pacific freight department shows a much more favorable state of affairs than in the previous report. Wheat is about harvested in many localities along the branches north of Columbus and Grand Island. The crop has done splendidly and the yield will be a full average, probably fifteen to twenty bushels to the acre. In other localities the dry weather early in the season seriously affected the crop and the yield will not be more than one-third to one-half an average. West of Kearney the yield is merely nominal except in a few localities.

Rain in Texas.

SAN ANTONIO, Tex., July 24.—Rain commenced falling here yesterday afternoon, continuing throughout the night. Judging from the drift of the clouds and the reports which have been received here the downpour has been general throughout this section of Texas. It came just in time.

THE "FAIR TRADERS."

A Small Faction of English Tories Who Favor a Small Literature For American Protectionists.

There has recently sprung up in England a small faction of Tory politicians who call themselves "Fair Traders." These men are protectionists, but they do not take that name in an atmosphere where protection is an out-worn superstition, discarded alike by the Tory Lord Salisbury and the Liberal Gladstone.

The "Fair Traders" have only come to the surface within the past few years, and are totally without influence upon the policy of England. However, they have started a little paper and are determined to make themselves heard. This little paper is never heard of on this side of the water, except when it is approvingly quoted by our protectionist organ, the "American Economist," to show, forsooth, that England is going to adopt the great protectionist system.

It may be said in passing that it is a most singular thing to see the Economist expressing pleasure over what it fancies to be the growth of protection in England. The Economist ought to know that more than half of our exports go to England, and that the adoption of protection there would be very harmful to us—especially to our farmers who produce about three-fourths of our exports.

The "fair traders" consider the present policy of England in trading with other nations without any custom-house restrictions to be unjust and unfair. The goods of all countries are admitted free into England, except a few revenue articles; but nearly every thing manufactured and exported by England has to meet heavy duties upon passing into other nations. This the "fair traders" say is unfair, and they propose to make it fair, and hence their name.

But how do they propose to make it fair? Let us take an illustration from our treasury reports for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1890. During that year we bought in England, in round numbers, \$21,000,000 worth of tin-plate, and our Government made the American buyers pay the further sum of \$7,340,000 as duty on it. Now we paid for our tin-plate, not in money, but in American products of some kind. Let us say for convenience that we paid it in flour. The position of the English "fair trader" then would be this: "We have sent Americans \$21,000,000 worth of tin-plate, but the American buyers were compelled by their Government to pay \$7,000,000 for the privilege of trading with us—and that is unfair. But we will get even with them; when they send over \$21,000,000 worth of flour to pay for that tin-plate, we will make the English bread-eaters pay \$7,000,000 extra for the privilege of buying bread. That will make things even. Let us have fair trade."

The absolute ignorance and stupidity of such a proposition makes it almost impossible to believe that there is any one man on the earth who is capable of such folly. "The American Government makes it difficult for the American people to can their fruit and vegetables in our tin-plate; therefore we will make it difficult for English workers to buy American flour." The man who talks that way is ready for a board of expert physicians to examine into his mental condition.

But it is talk of that kind that delights the "American Economist," for it is nothing other than the great "American system," otherwise known as "protection."

The absurd position of the English "fair trader" is precisely the same as that of the American protectionist; and a fellow-feeling of stupidity makes them wondrous kind to each other.

HUNGRY FOR BOUNTIES.

The Sugar Bounty Extended to the Maple Sugar Men, and Other Applicants For Public Fap Put in Their Claims—Now Let the Growers of Wheat and Cotton Speak Out—McKinley Makes a Weak Defense of His Bounty By a Misfit Quotation From Hamilton.

Once the Government starts out to giving bounties there will be no point at which it can stop without leaving many unhappy bounty-hunters grumbling because they were left out in the cold.

No sooner was it known that McKinley gave a bounty of two cents a pound on sugar than the Vermont people, who produce a small quantity of maple sugar, beset the Senate Finance Committee and pleaded to be included in the bounty clause of the bill.

Of course they could bring forward very strong arguments. "Why make a discrimination against our maple sugar? Is it not sugar, too, just as well as cane or beet-root sugar? Does it not grow out of the ground—and American ground at that? Does it not require labor—American labor? Why not put all American sugar on the same footing?"

Well, the Senate committee said that the maple sugar men had the better of the argument, and so maple sugar goes into the bill for the two-cent bounty on every pound produced. Thus the makers of maple sugar, as well as the growers of cane and beet-root sugar, are to be paid to do their own business—paid out of taxes collected from the people.

As the Senate committee showed itself to be so generous to the maple sugar men other bounty-hunters have come forward to ask an extension of Government charity. This time it is the makers of grape sugar and glucose, which are largely used to adulterate other products. They have also an American article, employ American labor, and make a sugar too. Why should they be left out? They are just as

thirsty for Government aid as any of the other sugar makers. Now let us see whether the Senate committee can give any good reason for not taking the grape sugar and glucose men in out of the cold?

If McKinley and his tariff-makers were asked why it is necessary to give a bounty on sugar they would talk about our sugar-growers not being able to compete with the cheap labor of the West Indies, South America and Germany; and they would give you carefully constructed tables showing the wages of farm laborers in those countries. Of course, they will say, our sugar-growers can not compete with the cheap labor, and therefore we must help them in the unequal struggle by giving them a bounty.

But does not McKinley see that if the cheap-labor argument is to be used to defend his sugar bounty, the same argument would apply equally well to the growers of wheat and cotton? The growers of American wheat are compelled to sell their crop in competition with the cheap labor of Russia and India; and the American cotton-growers must meet on the wharves of Liverpool the cotton produced by the miserably paid labor of India and Egypt. How can they do this without a bounty? Are not the wheat and cotton growers good and worthy American citizens? Do they not give employment to American labor?

When Mr. McKinley brought his Tariff bill into the House he accompanied it with a report in which he attempted to bolster up his sugar bounty by quoting Alexander Hamilton, and saying that "the sanction of no higher authority in American statesmanship could be invoked."

Then he makes a quotation from Hamilton in defense of bounties; but the quotation itself shows in plain black and white that Hamilton was advocating bounties "to stimulate and uphold new enterprises;" they were to be applied "to the acquisition of a new and useful branch of industry," and Hamilton's bounty was to be "a temporary expense."

Seldom has a public man ever quoted an authority so inaptly as McKinley did in this case; for sugar-growing is not "a new industry" under the most liberal interpretation of Hamilton's words; and to speak of the "acquisition" of it is simply a gross misuse of the English language. Again, Hamilton speaks of a "temporary" expense for the establishment of an industry. What right has McKinley to assume that at the end of his fifteen years' bounty the sugar-growing industry will be any more able to stand on its own feet than it is to-day? It has already existed long enough to develop the necessary skill; and it is folly to hope that the bounty will have the slightest effect in developing a greater degree of skill in our sugar-making process, or that this greater skill will be added as a permanent factor to the wealth-producing capacity of the Nation.

As the matter stands McKinley gives the sugar men \$7,000,000 a year out of the people's taxes; but how much that will grow to in fifteen years nobody knows. It may be twice as much or it may be ten times as much. But if the sum should even remain the same, that would mean \$105,000,000 for the fifteen years—which is certainly an enormous sum to pay people for doing their own private business.

McKinley, however, is a champion when it comes to knocking out a surplus. But he sees that the people are going to object to giving away this enormous sum of money; and so he fixes the donation for a period of fifteen years, hoping that thereby future Congresses can not undo his iniquitous bounty giving.

Smuggling at New York.

Extensive smuggling of clothing has been detected by the Government officials in New York. The stewards, cooks and other employees of the great ocean steamers were hired to bring over the bundles of clothing, which were finally carried ashore in bundles of linen for the laundry.

The thing has been going on for a long time, but the recent seizure of a number of bundles of clothing and the arrest of several of the guilty persons will make the smugglers lie low for the future, and all orders for smuggled clothing will doubtless be "declared off."

But how does it happen that men find it profitable to smuggle? Have not the protectionist politicians been telling us all along that clothes are as cheap here as in Europe?

There must be some mistake about that. The smugglers are a standing proof that this is all poppycock. The smugglers are, in their way, a capital tariff reform argument.

As a matter of fact clothing cost about twice as much here as in England; and this can be proven over and over again.

But McKinley himself gives the best answer to this false claim of his protectionist brethren—he raises the high duty on clothing to a still higher point and tells us boldly in his tariff speech: "We want no return to cheap times in our own country."

If clothing were the same price here as in Europe the smuggler's occupation—and McKinley's too, for that matter—would be gone.

—The home producers, by trusts and combinations, limiting production, forcing idleness, or half-time work on their operatives, and maintaining prices a fraction below the foreign price, with the tariff tax and the cost added, pocket all that Congress authorizes them to compel the people to pay.

CROP PROSPECTS.

The Latest Reports Show a Falling Off Owing to the Continued Dry Weather.

CHICAGO, July 30.—The following appears in the Farmer's Review: The majority of our correspondents in Missouri, Kentucky and Minnesota report local showers that have in a measure revived parched fields. One-third of our Ohio correspondents report local rains, but the uniform report from other parts of the State is, "very dry." Except in a few scattering counties drought is general throughout Illinois, Indiana, Iowa and the Dakotas.

The effect of this widespread drought is most marked upon the potato crop, the present condition of which is 40 per cent. lower than last year at this season. From the present outlook the Dakotas and Minnesota are the only States that promise any thing like a fair crop.

A great decline has taken place in the condition of corn during the past two weeks. The Dakotas are the only States that apparently maintain a high average, and in these States the condition is not uniform. The reports from a few counties are from 50 to 75 per cent. below the average, while in the majority of instances the reports range from 100 to 125 per cent. Since our last report the general averages have fallen off 15 points in Ohio, Kentucky and Nebraska; in Kansas the decline amounts to 125 points; in Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and Minnesota it ranges from 5 to 10 points.

No marked change is observable in Nebraska and Iowa reports relative to spring wheat, but in Minnesota and the Dakotas the averages of condition have declined several points. We summarize as follows the reports of our correspondents:

Condition of potatoes—Illinois, 40 per cent.; Indiana, 50; Missouri, 50; Kentucky, 41; Kansas, 61; Minnesota, 87; Dakota, 90; Nebraska, 50; Iowa, 68.

Condition of corn—Illinois, 71 per cent.; Indiana, 83; Missouri, 70; Ohio, 60; Kentucky, 60; Kansas, 50; Minnesota, 80; Dakota, 90; Nebraska, 75; Iowa, 90.

Condition of spring wheat—Minnesota, 79 per cent.; Dakota, 81; Nebraska, 72; Iowa, 80.

COLLAPSED REVOLUTION.

The Argentine Rebellion Comes to a Sudden End—The Central American Rumpus.

LONDON, July 30.—It is officially announced that the British Foreign Office has received telegraphic advices from Buenos Ayres that the revolution has ended in the triumph of the Government.

The Argentine legation in London received last night the following telegram signed by Minister of Finance Garcia:

BUENOS AYRES, July 29.—The Government is completely victorious. The mutineers have capitulated and deposited their arms in the arsenal. All rebellious superior officers will be dismissed. The troops are returning to their quarters under the command of loyal officers. The minor officers participating in the revolution will be transferred to positions of less influence. The forces mobilized by the Government are returning to the provinces. The political situation is thoroughly consolidated. The capital and the whole country are tranquil.

CENTRAL AMERICA.

CITY OF MEXICO, July 30.—A private telegram to a commercial house in this city states that in Saturday's battle the Salvadorians were defeated by the Guatemalans and sustained a loss of sixty killed, 200 wounded and a large number of prisoners. The Guatemalan loss was very light.

Geronimo Poi, agent of San Salvador, says that in the eleven battles to date the Salvadorians have come out victorious. The Guatemalan army is fleeing in all directions toward the interior and not a single Guatemalan soldier is left on the frontier.

A revolution against Barrillas has broken out in the Eastern Department. Several well known Generals head it and the downfall of the present Guatemalan Government is considered more than probable. Barrillas is pleading for foreign intervention in his favor.

Disastrous Fire.

EAST SAGINAW, Mich., July 30.—Yesterday afternoon fire originating from a spark from a mill stack, destroyed Owen, Hutchinson & Co.'s mill and 4,000,000 feet of lumber; Brown & Ryan's mill, drill houses and 11,000,000 feet of lumber; Nease & Son's mill and 3,000,000 feet of lumber, several small buildings and twenty freight cars belonging to the Flint & Marquette Railroad Company.

The loss is about \$535,000. Among the heaviest losers are Owen Hutchinson & Co., \$260,000; John G. Owen, \$19,500; John G. Owen, two drill houses, \$5,000; Nease & Son, mill \$40,000; Nease & Son, lumber \$39,000; Brown & Ryan, mill \$45,000, lumber \$143,000; Brown & Ryan, salt block \$8,000, drill house \$2,500, wood \$2,000, ten dwellings \$3,000. The insurance will not nearly cover the loss.

Dynamiter Mooney Drowned.

NEW YORK, July 30.—James Mooney, the dynamiter, was drowned in the surf at Rockaway Sunday and his body has not been recovered. He attained his greatest public notoriety a few years ago by his attempt to blow up the British steamship Queen while she was at her wharf in the North river and about to sail for Liverpool. He approached the ship in a row boat and the explosives, which he fired under her bows, created a panic on board, but did no serious damage. He was arrested and his counsel entering a plea of insanity he was sent to a lunatic asylum. He was recently released on the certificates of physicians stating that he had fully recovered.